

Remarks

Applicants have amended the claims 1 to correct typographical errors.

5 In the third paragraph (there are two third paragraphs, this one is the second one) of the Official Action, Examiner rejected claims 1, 8, 15 and 22 as attempting obvious-type double patenting over attorney docket 1286, application serial number 10/027,011. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

10 Claim 1 will be used as a representative claim in each application as was done by Examiner.

In the present application, claim 1 recites,  
"responsive to the at least one indication retrieved having the first state, forwarding the communication with the  
15 source identifier received with the communication; and responsive to the at least one indication retrieved having the second state, forwarding the communication with an alternate source identifier different from the source identifier received with the communication"

20 In claim 1 of the present application, the communication is forwarded regardless of the state of the at least one indication. Access is not selectively granted as in the other application: the communication is

forwarded, it just gets forwarded with a different source identifier depending on a state of at least one indication retrieved: the source identifier received with the communication or an alternate one.

5        In the other application, claim 1 recites,  
"selectively granting access to a network to a communication received from a device having the device identifier received, responsive to the at least one set of privileges received".

10        Thus, claim 1 in the other *application selectively grants access to a network* responsive to a set of at least one privilege. Because access is *selectively granted*, access is not always granted.

15        Thus, the present application forwards a communication with a different source identifier. The other application might not forward the communication at all.

20        The other claims in each application recite similar language as noted by Examiner. Thus, the claims are patentably distinguishable from one another and do not represent an attempt at obviousness-type double patenting.

      In Paragraph 4 of the Official Action, Examiner rejected claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as not being enabled. Examiner appears to object to the language "receiving for each of a plurality of users an

indication having one selected from a first state and a second state" of claim 1, and similar language in the other independent claims. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

5        Examiner's attention is respectfully drawn to the crossover sentence of page 109, which reads, "If privileges for the user corresponding to the device from which the frame was received ***indicate that operation in real IP mode is possible 342***, the method continues at step ***710*** of Figure 10 ***7*** and ***otherwise***, the method continues at step ***344***."

(Emphasis is in bold italics.) This sentence shows that the privileges for users contain an indication that has one selected from a first state (operation in real IP mode is possible) and a second state (otherwise). Page 21, lines

15    6-8 and page 26, lines 3-14 state show that there are privileges records for each of a plurality of users as claimed. The descriptions of the areas of the specification in which the claims are supported are not intended to be exhaustive, as there may be additional 20 support in the specification for the claim language. Thus, Examiner is requested to withdraw the objection.

As a result of the discussion above, the first state and second state are illustrated outside the decision

diamond 342 of Figure 3A, "possible" and "not possible" are a first state and second state of the indication, and so Examiner is requested to withdraw the objection to the drawings in Paragraph 3 of the Official Action.

5           Examiner states in the second paragraph that the specification discloses that the indication can be "possible" and "not possible" is not part of the claim. However, "possible" and "not possible" are two different disclosed states. Thus, they *do* enable the claim.

10           It isn't necessary for the language of the specification to match that of the claim: it is permissible for the claim to be broader than the specification as long as the specification discloses something that each element of the claim reads on. As a simplified example, if the  
15           specification discloses three wheels, and the claim discloses a plurality of wheels, the claim element has been enabled. It is not necessary or even desirable to list every possible number of wheels. The fact that the three wheels disclosed is encompassed by the claim language "a  
20           plurality of wheels", that is all that is necessary. One could even claim a plurality of objects and not even mention the word wheels in the claims and the claims would be enabled. The claimed element would still be supported

in that case because the claim element reads on three wheels.

Thus, it isn't necessary for the language of the specification to match the language of the claim. All that  
5 is necessary is that one example of each claim element is disclosed in the specification.

In this application, the claims are similarly supported by the specification. An example of the claim language, "receiving for each of a plurality of users an  
10 indication having one selected from a first state and a second state" is fully supported in the specification in at least two ways as noted above, and so the claim language is supported under 35 U.S.C. 112.

Also in the fourth paragraph, Examiner states that it  
15 is not clear whether the indication has the first state and the second state or the first state or the second state. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites, "an indication having one selected from a first state and a second state". Examiner is  
20 respectfully requested to note the use of the word "one" in the above language. This means the indication has only one state, a first state or a second state, but not both. This

language has been in the claim all along. The language is a Markush group described at M.P.E.P. 2173.05(h).

Claims 8, 15 and 22 recite, "an indication having one selected from a first state and a second state". All of the other claims depend from claim 1, 8, 15 or 22, and thus all of the claims recite this feature. Thus, the claims are clear with respect to there being only one of the first and second state and thus, Examiner is requested to withdraw the rejection.

10 In the fifth through tenth paragraphs of the Official Action, Examiner rejected claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Keeler (US 6,502,130). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites, "responsive to the at least one indication retrieved having the first state, forwarding the communication with the source identifier received with the communication; and responsive to the indication retrieved having the second state, forwarding the communication with an alternate source identifier different from the source identifier received with the communication". Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1 and contain all of its features.

Claim 8 recites, a "network address translation manager for providing at an output a third communication

comprising: at least a portion of the source identifier,  
responsive to at least one of the at least one indications  
received at the privileges requestor input having the first  
state; and a third source identifier responsive to at least  
5 one of the at least one indications received at the  
privileges requestor input having the second state".

Claims 9-14 depend from claim 8 and contain all of its  
features.

Claim 15 recites, "responsive to the at least one  
10 indication retrieved having the first state, forward the  
communication with the source identifier received with the  
communication; and responsive to the at least one  
indication retrieved having the second state, forward the  
communication with an alternate source identifier different  
15 from the source identifier received with the  
communication".

Claim 22 recites, "responsive to the at least one  
indication retrieved having the first state, forwarding the  
communication with the source identifier received with the  
20 communication; and responsive to the at least one  
indication retrieved having the second state, forwarding  
the communication with an alternate source identifier  
different from the source identifier received with the  
communication".

These claimed features provide a communication with one source identifier if the indication has a first state, or a different source identifier if the indication has a second state. The use of the term "and" in the claim language should not be meant to imply that both source identifiers must be supplied, as one or the other may be supplied under the claims because although both statements apply, only one will be applicable because the indication will either have the first state or the second state as is described in the claims.

These claimed features are not shown by Keeler. Keeler addresses an XID that appears to be used instead of the MAC address of a device if the device has permission to communicate over the SNA network. However, Keeler does not allow the communication to be forwarded with an alternate source identifier if an indication is in a second state, for example, the device does not have permission to communicate over the SNA network. In that case, the communication does not appear to be forwarded at all.

In the third paragraph (the first of the two third paragraphs), Examiner notes that Keeler discloses that the routine sends the information to a log and collects the MAC ID and TCP/IP address. However, there is nothing in Keeler that states that 1) there are different source identifiers



sent 2) with the communication 3) responsive to a state of  
an indication as claimed.

Thus, claims 1, 8, 15 and 22 are patentably  
distinguishable over Keeler. Because claim 2-7 depend from  
5 claim 1, and claims 9-13 depend from claim 8, claims 1-13,  
15 and 22 are patentably distinguishable over Keeler.

Claims 23-26 depend from claims 22, 15, 8 and 1,  
respectively, and are patentably distinguishable for the  
same reasons as the independent claims from which they  
10 depend.

Claims 1-26 are in condition for allowance. Favorable  
action is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

December 21, 2005

15

By:

Charles E. Gottlieb

Registration No. 38,164

Innovation Partners

20

540 University Ave., Suite 300

Palo Alto, CA 94301

(650) 328-0100